

Date: Fri, 10 Dec 93 04:30:21 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #520  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 10 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 520

Today's Topics:

ARRL's callsign admin position  
Can my wife transmit?  
W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 9 Dec 93 15:46:58 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!  
psinnntp!arrl.org@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, dan@mystis.wariat.org  
(Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>As I said, I have been impressed of late and am considering sending the  
>ARRL a dues check. However there are many organizations that represent a  
>good number of amateurs (W5YI as an example).

Dan,

I am pleased that you are considering supporting the ARRL. In spite  
of the fact that we don't always do everything exactly the way  
\*everyone\* would like, I feel that there are many important things  
that we are doing that deserve support.

>But, maybe you are right, we need a second national ham group. Anyone  
>wanna help me start one?

I am indeed interested; my choice to work here stems from a strong desire to give back to ham radio a bit more that it has given me. My loyalty is NOT to the ARRL, but to the concept that we try to embody. If you are really willing to do all of what it takes to put together a better national organization, (assuming it really does come out better), you will have my support. I am glad that you, too, share the same sense of dedication to Amateur Radio and are willing to make some of the personal sacrifices of your personal time that will go into forming such an organization!

Before I jump in, though, I would like to have some idea of the goals of your proposed organization. Do you have a charter? A rough draft of the bylaws? I am especially interested in the ways it would be \*different\* from the several other major ham-radio organizations? I what way would it be different from the ARRL? If you are going to use the same political structure, why would yours work any differently from ours, or QCWA's, or NARA's. (I am not really sure what W5YI is, but let's include him/them for the sake of discussion.)

What major flaws do you perceive in the ARRL and the other organizations and how would you structure the organization you are proposing to overcome those flaws. And, IMHO, the most important question -- please explain to me why it is better for Amateur Radio to create a new organization from scratch than to identify the problems in the existing structures and make them a more effective tool for the Good of All.

This should make for an interesting discussion; I am sure the usenet amateur community will be patient waiting for your answers and more information. We all do understand that developing answers to these questions could not be an off-the-cuff sort of thing. It takes hundreds of hours, and many thousands of dollars in legal fees and other "incorporation" fees to put together a national not-for-profit organization. It is nice to see that there are those willing to make these sacrifices. Speaking of dollars, I \*will\* join the first year, just as soon as all of the paperwork makes it a viable organization, but I am not sure I will sign up every year, and the first time you do anything I don't like, it is over. :-).

73 and Happy Holidays from ARRL HQ! Ed

-----

Ed Hare, KA1CV  
American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111

ehare@arrl.org

My posts and views do not necessarily

(203) 666-1541 - voice            represent the policy of the ARRL,  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor       but I can probably get in trouble  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing       for them anyway!

-----

-----  
Date: 9 Dec 93 20:04:25 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Can my wife transmit?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <36071@ksr.com>, jfw@ksr.com (John F. Woods) writes:

> But it turns out that the Communications Act of 1934 authorizes \*anyone\*, not  
> just hams, to use any radio at their disposal in an emergency involving  
> possible loss of life if normal means of communication are unavailable.

This opens up a whole can of legal worms. Let's try another example...

My wife and 4-year-old son are on a not-so-well traveled highway between  
cities. She has car trouble. It's dark. It's the middle of Winter.  
She has waited for an hour. The few cars that went by did not stop to help.

She fires up my 50 Watt 2-meter mobile rig that I have conveniently  
locked-on to one of the well-used, wide-coverage repeaters in the area.  
She transmits, asks for help, and the sheriff soon arrives and rescues  
them.

Will she be fined for transmitting on amateur bands without a licence?  
Will I be fined? Will I loose my licence? Will the radio be confiscated?

Does she have to nearly die from exposure before it is obviously a life  
or death situation?

What about something not so life threatening: she has car trouble (even  
something as simple as a flat tire) in a not-so-nice area of town.  
Can she call for help on 2 meters? Does she have to wait till the  
robbers and rapists are pounding on the windows (and removing the  
antenna) before she can call for help?? Please, ARRL and FCC people,  
can you answer this one? Thanks.

--

```
/'- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com |  
{      }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc |   I suport publick skools! ;-)  
\      /  Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA |  
|__*|   N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio |
```

-----  
Date: 7 Dec 1993 22:57:13 -0600  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cbr600@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec7.183422.29800@cs.brown.edu>, md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> mebly@eng.umd.edu writes:

>

> > You can't do it this way. (HINT: Ever wonder why /AT isn't used for  
> > technician upgrades?)

>

> No, I'm clueless. Why isn't /AT used for tech upgrades?

>

> MD

> --

> -- Michael P. Deignan

> -- Population Studies & Training Center

> -- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912

> -- (401) 863-7284

Well, it's because AT is not a valid prefix for US operation (or that's what I'm told). US only has the prefixes AA-AL so AT would be an invalid prefix for the united states. That's also why we can't have A prefix's for 1x3 Tech/General callsigns. :( Here in 0-land, we're just about out of 1x3 calls and most other areas are already out of them. Seems to me instead of dropping down to 2x3 Novice the FCC should start recycling old w0 and k0 calls that are no longer used! Oh, well, whoever said the buearucracy was sane.

Smiley's implied, of course!!!

-----  
Jeremy L. Utley | jlu@cygnus.cis.ksu.edu  
Computer Science Dept. | cbr600@matt.ksu.ksu.edu  
Student | cbr600@ksuvm.bitnet  
Kansas State Univ. | bxth85a (Prodigy)  
A.S. Comp. Sci. & Acctg. | N0YAX@N00ER.#NEKS.KS.USA.NA  
-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #520

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*